

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office

4 44	COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
vonces.	COMMISSIONER FOR FATER 13
	P.O. Box 1450
	Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
	www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.		
10/663,997	09/17/2003	Soon Jo Lee	9988.058.00-US	1982		
30827 75	30827 7590 02/03/2005			EXAMINER		
MCKENNA I 1900 K STREE	LONG & ALDRIDG	GRAVINI, STEPHEN MICHAEL				
	N, DC 20006		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER		
	,		3749			
			DATE MAILED: 02/03/200	5		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Applicati n N .	Applicant(s)					
	10/663,997	LEE ET AL.					
Office Action Summary	Examin r	Art Unit					
	Stephen Gravini	3749					
The MAILING DATE f this communication a Period for Reply	ppears on the c ver sheet w	ith the correspondence address	·				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION. - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).							
Status							
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22	November 2004.						
2a)⊠ This action is FINAL . 2b)□ Th	his action is non-final.						
	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposition of Claims							
5) ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. 6) ☑ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected. 7) ☐ Claim(s) is/are objected to.	 ✓ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are pending in the application. 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration. ☐ Claim(s) is/are allowed. ✓ Claim(s) <u>1-6</u> is/are rejected. 						
Application Papers							
9) The specification is objected to by the Exami	iner.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.							
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).							
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the corn 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the							
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119							
 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) All b) Some * c) None of: 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
Address			٠.				
Attachment(s) 1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview	Summary (PTO-413)					
2) Notice of References Clied (PTO-692) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No	s)/Mail Date					
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/0 Paper No(s)/Mail Date	08) 5) Notice of 6) Other:	nformal Patent Application (PTO-152)					

Art Unit: 3749

DETAILED ACTION

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Priority

Receipt is acknowledged of papers submitted under 35 U.S.C. 119(a)-(d), which papers have been placed of record in the file.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Robineau (US 6,195,910). Robineau is considered to disclose the claimed invention comprising:

- a base 24 forming a floor of a body;
- a front cabinet 18 forming a front portion of the body;
- a side cabinet 26 forming a side portion of the body;
- a back cover 20 forming a back portion of the body;
- a control panel **28** having a hook (please see column 10 lines 12-15 for the express teaching of the panel having a hook);

a top cover 22 forming a top of the body wherein the top cover has a predetermined curvature, and wherein the control panel is provided on a rear portion of the top cover, the top cover comprising a groove provided at rear portion of the top cover wherein the hook is disposed in a surface of the control panel opposite the top cover such that the hook inserts into the groove (please see column 10 lines 12-15 again wherein the disclosed loop is considered to

Art Unit: 3749

inherently anticipate the claimed groove because both a loop and a groove are used to dispose a hook in a control panel surface opposite a top cover); and

a fire wall **34** made of metal, and provided at a lower portion of the top cover (wherein the firewall definition is reasonably construed under the broadest meaning consistent with the specification since the non-patent literature cited in this action shows that is well known the metal back of dryers act as firewalls, thereby inherently anticipating the claimed invention). Robineau is also considered to disclose the firewall having the same predetermined curvature because the figures show that the firewall and groove have a predetermined curvature which is the same.

Claims 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Gerhardt (US 2,966,051).

Double Patenting

The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the "right to exclude" granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. See *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970);and, *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent is shown to be commonly owned with this application. See 37 CFR 1.130(b).

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Art Unit: 3749

Claims 1-6 are provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 15-25 of copending Application No. 10/629,775. Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the presently claimed firewall is considered to be an obvious variation to the copending claimed fire plate.

This is a <u>provisional</u> obviousness-type double patenting rejection because the conflicting claims have not in fact been patented.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-3 have been considered but are most in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. References C-G and U-W, cited in this application, are considered to disclose features capable of obviating the claimed invention.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory

Art Unit: 3749

period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen Gravini whose telephone number is 571 272 4875. The examiner can normally be reached on normal weekday business hours (east coast time).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ira S. Lazarus can be reached on 571 272 4877. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

SMG February 1, 2005